4HQ
442
Copy 1

FT MEADE
GenColl

WHAT THE YOUNG NEED TO KNOW

A Primer of Sex Rationalism

BY EDWIN C. WALKER

Second Edition

A great city is that which has the greatest men and women,
If it be a few ragged huts it is still the greatest city in the whole world.

—WALT WHITMAN.

NEW YORK: Published by Edwin C. Walker, at 244 West One Hundred and Forty-third Street, in October, Nineteen Hundred and Five.
Price, Fifteen Cents

WHO IS THE ENEMY; ANTHONY COMSTOCK OR YOU?

A Study of the Censorship

BY EDWIN C. WALKER

Of especial interest now because of the latest assault on MOSES HARMAN and "Lucifer"

Price, 20 Cents

DO YOU WANT FREE SPEECH?

BY JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

Another very timely pamphlet on the Censorship

Price, 10 Cents

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST FREE SPEECH AND FREE PRESS

BY GEO. PYBURN, M. D.

This booklet should be read by the careless and indifferent multitude, but it will not be; only you will care for it

Price, 6 Cents; two copies, 10 Cents

MODERN MARRIAGE

BY EMILE ZOLA

Four pen-pictures of marital felicity in four degrees of French life Price, 15 Cents

---

EDWIN C. WALKER,
244 W. 143d St., New York City

4-H&
442

THE CRIME OF CREDULITY

BY HERBERT N. CASSON

"Those who take for granted the freedom and advancement of the Twentieth century, and are unaware of the desperate conflicts that were waged by scientists and by thinkers to emancipate us from mystical superstitions, are being deceived by the new forms in which these superstitions are being revived. Credulity in all its mystical phases is a crime against social progress. It is impossible to perpetuate a civilization based on skepticism and the endeavors of human reason, if the credulity and devout faith of the Middle Ages be revived."

Price, paper, 25 Cents; cloth, 75 Cents

HOW THE UNITED STATES CURTAILS FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

BY ERNEST HOWARD CROSBY

"The North American Review" examination of the JOHN TURNER case—a sample of the port-of-entry phase of our multiform Censorship

Price, 10 Cents

THE SECRET INSTRUCTIONS OF THE JESUITS

From the London Edition, Printed for JOHN WALTHOE, JR., Over Against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, M.DCC.XXIII.

Au défaut de la Force, il faut employer la Ruse.—Motto to Layer's Scheme

Price, 15 Cents

THE BALLAD OF READING GAOL

BY OSCAR WILDE. 10c, 15c, 50c, $1, $5, $10

EDWIN C. WALKER,
244 W. 143d St., New York City

Tyranny begins her argument by fettering free speech. Begin your reply by breaking your fetters.—MIRABEAU.

Let us ponder boldly—'t is a base
Abandonment of reason, to resign
Our right of thought—our last and only place
Of refuge; this, at least, shall still be mine!
Though from our birth the faculty divine
Is chained and tortured—cabin'd, cribbed, confined,
And bred in darkness, lest the truth should shine
Too lightly on the unprepared mind.

—BYRON.

We see clearly that it is good for every man among us that he and every other man should be as strong, as tall, as well-knit, as supple, as wholesome, as effective, as free from vice or defect, as possible. We see clearly that it is his first duty to make his own muscles, his own organs, his own bodily functions, as perfect as he can make them, and to transmit them in like perfection, unspoiled, to his descendants. We see clearly that it is good for every woman among us that she and every other woman should be as physically developed and as finely equipped for her place as mother as it is possible to make herself. We see that it is good for every woman that there should be such men, and for every man that there should be such women. We see it is good for every child that it should be born of such a father and such a mother. . . . It is our duty to make ourselves acquainted, so far as we can, with the universe around us, and every part of it; to know what is known of sun, moon, and stars, planet, comet, and nebula; of beast, bird, and fish; tree, herb, and fungus; of human origins and human life; of institutions and laws, the right and the wrong of them. . . . I maintain . that everything high and ennobling in our nature springs directly out of the sexual instinct. Its alliance is wholly with whatever is purest and most beautiful within us.—GRANT ALLEN, "The New Hedonism."

What the Young Need to Know

A PRIMER OF SEX RATIONALISM

BY EDWIN C. WALKER

Second Edition

For Humanity sweeps onward; where to-day the martyr stands,
On the morrow crouches Judas with the silver in his hands;
Far in front the cross stands ready and the crackling fagots burn,
While the hooting mob of yesterday in silent awe return
To glean up the scattered ashes into History's golden urn.

—JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

NEW YORK: Published by Edwin C. Walker, at 244 West One Hundred and Forty-third Street, in October, Nineteen Hundred and Five.
Price, Fifteen Cents

Suggestions of Contents

Is there Necessity for this Knowledge?	5
Analogous Dangers and Safeguards,	6
Unwisdom of Custom-sanctioned Ignorance,	7
Teachers Better if of Opposite Sex,	8
Divisions of the Subject,	9
Definitions of Sex,	10
Evolution of Sex; Differentiation,	11
Reproduction Less and Less Perilous,	13
Inestimable Value of Use,	14
Joy is Positive, Upbuilding,	15
The Deciding Majority of Two,	17
The Tendency to Multi-Selection,	18
A Serious Error in Exchange,	20
Effects of Meat, Stimulants, and Narcotics,	21
Reproduction and Social Happiness,	23
Not so Many Children, but Better Ones,	24
Legal Intrusion has a Limit,	25
Voluntary Complexity, and Health,	25
Comparative Exemption of the Jews,	27
The Upward March,	28
Cruel and Irremediable Punishments,	28
Origin of the Shame of Sex,	30
Derived from Other-World Mania,	31
"The Son of God" and Sex,	33
Faithful Followers of Jesus,	34
Relation of Past Asceticism to Existing Type,	36
Mental Slaves are not Investigators,	37
Romauld and Clarimonde,	38
Sex Manifestation Below Our Race,	39
Sex Inspiration in Human Endeavor,	40
What is Immodesty?	41
Primitive and Present-Day Savage Customs in Dress,	41
Civillzed Customs and Costumes,	43
What We Affirm on This Subject,	44
Bathing and Dress,	45
Asceticism and Honesty in Art,	45
Arguments of the Puritan,	46
Judge PHILLIPS and Mr. MOODY,	47
To Take the Purity of Nudity in Art for Granted,	47
Asceticism and Literature,	48
Foolishness of Hiding Social Wrongs,	49
Take off the Taboo,	50

Gift
W. M. Miller

NOV 18 1955

5
Copy

WHAT THE YOUNG NEED TO KNOW—A PRIMER OF SEX RATIONALISM

BY EDWIN C. WALKER

Q.—Do you think that the young "need to know" anything about sex and its manifestations?

A.—I do.

Q.—How much should they be taught?

A.—All that they have the capacity to understand.

Q.—By whom should they be taught?

A.—By their parents, or other competent persons.

Q.—At what age should they receive this instruction?

A.—At as early an age as they, severally, appear to stand in need of it, and this is generally much earlier than most parents and teachers, even unprejudiced and intelligent men and women, seem to think.

Q.—Is there not danger that, following this rule, the mind of the child may be too early led to think on the subject of sex, thus inducing a precocious and therefore unhealthful development?

A.—Yes, just as there is grave danger to the mind and body of the child in the existing system of instruction as a whole. Our methods of education are very faulty, very dangerous. Mental and emotional development are hurried forward at a terrific pace; the memory of the child is tremendously overtaxed; its brain is loaded down with a great mass of detached facts which, often, it is utterly unable to put in order or to assimilate. In a word, the brain is given more work than it can perform. The result is nervous overstrain. The body hastens in its growth to reinforce

the centers of intellectual and nervous activity. So the sexual impulses are early aroused. This makes it imperatively necessary that we put the young on guard against the misdirection and abuse of their sexual forces. Ignorance is not the safeguard of innocence, but even if it were, the child will not remain ignorant. It will get some kind of instruction from its school- and playmates, from nurses and stablemen, and from other older associates. The chances are that this instruction will be unscientific, and therefore misleading, and probably also vicious in that it will convey the impression that sex is something to conceal and of which to be ashamed. The prudent parent will endeavor to forestall all such education, which is miseducation. It is far better, therefore, to tell your child all about the sex organs, impulses, and feelings, and their effect upon the individual and the race; and this before he or she has become conscious of the existence of these organs as sex organs or has been stirred by these impulses and feelings. It is scarcely conceivable that you would give your child any tool or machine without first imparting some instruction as to its purpose and how to use it safely and effectively. Equally inconceivable is it that the rational parent will wait until the child has stumbled into the pitfalls of abuse or of sex-perversion before he says anything to it about those pitfalls and how to keep out of them.

Q.—But is it not true that a great deal of instruction and warning is thrown away; that many men and women learn only in the hard school of experience, and that often children carefully taught concerning their sex-natures fare as unfortunately as do those who grow up in ignorance?

A.—Of course; but such undeniable facts do not furnish a conclusive argument against rational instruction in sex matters. If they did, then we should be forced to tear down all our school houses and universities, burn our books, and destroy our printing plants, for it is indisputable that, in spite of all these educational facilities, multitudes of men and women who have had the opportunity to share in the enlightenment thus shed abroad are still wrapped in the clouds of ignorance, having profited little if any

by their years of study and all their subsequent reading. The objection amounts to this only: We are fallible; therefore the best system of education may utterly fail in some instances; but we still have reason to hold that education is better than ignorance, wisdom preferable to foolishness, and civilization more desirable than savagery.

Q.—Would you have instruction in regard to sex both negative and affirmative—that is, while giving the child timely warning of the dangers attending abuse and sex-perversions, would you also teach it how to use its sex organs to the best advantage to itself and others; would you give it detailed information as to the methods necessary to secure the greatest amount of healthful pleasure in love relations and the best results in offspring?

A.—Assuredly; I have already said, in reply to your second question, that children should be taught all they have the capacity to understand, and I will add here, although it also is a repetition, in substance, of other affirmations previously made, that they should be taught all this at as early a period in their lives as they attain the capacity necessary to understand the instruction given. If you do not sow wheat some one else may sow tares. We want an all-around education. We want the children to profit by the experience of the parents. We call ourselves the heirs of all the past, and in most departments of human thought and activity we profit by lessons learned by our remote ancestors. But when it comes to the relations, the most intensely delightful, the most momentous, relations of the sexes, we stumble ignorantly in darkness when we should walk intelligently upright in light. Each generation is forced to learn in sorrow what it should have received as a legacy of knowledge from the generations gone before. In all other fields of learning the child is kindly guided, and has recourse to the storehouse of the garnered wisdom of the ages. But in the field of sex it walks blindly alone and must pick up, bit by bit, out of the dirt of anti-naturalism, from amid the rocks and thorns of ignorance, the precious gems of truth, all stained with the blood of martyrdom. Why should not parents tell their children what they know of the relations of men and women?

Does not the mother teach her infant to walk, to talk, and later to read and to sew and cook? What would we say of the father, a farmer, who, instead of instructing his son in the use of modern agricultural implements and machines, should leave him in ignorance, to again invent, perhaps, the primitive tools used thousands of years ago by his semi-civilized ancestors? The parallel is not perfect, of course, for the farmer's son would naturally learn much of modern methods by observation, while as regards sex manifestation the average parent is precious careful that the child has no opportunity to profit by observation any more than by instruction. We are most stupid in regard to those concerns that most vitally affect the well-being of ourselves and of our children. Are men and women to be forever slaves of sexual superstition? Are they to be ever imbeciles and cowards in the face of the sphinx of sex?

Q.—Doubtless you agree with other writers on the subject of sex, especially with the authors of the books we are not to "lay on our center-tables"—that is to say, you believe that the mother should instruct her daughters and the father should teach his sons what it is desirable they should know about their sex functions?

A.—I maintain that that parent who is the better qualified to teach should give this instruction, regardless of sex. If both are qualified, let both teach, and, as a rule, the father is better as the instructor of his daughters, and the mother as the teacher of her sons. There should be sympathy between teachers and pupils, and there is usually more sympathy between mothers and sons and fathers and daughters than there is between mothers and daughters and fathers and sons. Understanding the origin and nature of sex, we can not fail to perceive that the alignment just indicated is the natural one. While on this subject, it may be interesting to call attention to another manifestation of sexual superstition. When women began to study medicine it was frequently urged in defense of the innovation that it was grossly indelicate, indecent, in fact, for women to be treated by men physicians, particularly in accouchement cases and when suffering from "diseases peculiar to their sex." It was strenuously insisted that women doctors

should attend women and men doctors should treat men. It is quite probable that the argument had its use in breaking down the barriers that kept women out of a useful occupation, but it is time for the silly superstition to die. Sex is a fact of which there is no occasion to be ashamed, and there is no reason worth serious consideration why men physicians should not attend women patients and women physicians care for men patients. On the contrary, there are good reasons why they should. There can be no doubt that, once superstition regarding sex is driven from the minds of people, women, will, as a rule, prefer to be cared for by men physicians and nurses, and men, in most instances, will choose women doctors and nurses. The sexes complement each other in all ways, and there is scarcely any place where they can help each other more than in the sick chamber. Only our abject slavery to the gods of mock propriety keeps us from recognizing this fact.

Q.—Having thus indicated the general principles upon which you would proceed to secure the best results in the sexual instruction of the young, into what main divisions does your subject naturally fall on the present occasion?

A.—Into two. First, I shall speak of the Origin of Sex, Forms of Sex, Uses of Sex, Limitation of the Number of Children, including under this sub-division the Differentiation of the Reproductive and Amative Functions, and the Trend of Evolution. Also, Sexual Diseases. In the Second Division I shall speak of The Prevalence and Power of Sex, and of Clothing, Art, and Literature in their relation to the fact of Sex.

Q.—Will the questions arranged by you be those the child would propound and the answers those the parent would give?

A.—In substance, only; it is manifestly impracticable to write in the simple and plain manner that the child and its parent would talk. The inquisitive child will ask a thousand questions that can not be reproduced here, and the teacher must adapt his language to the infant's comprehension, accompanying the words with such objective instruction as may be necessary. It would take too much space to go into details as the parent can, while the requisite plainness of expression is not possible in these pages, owing to the

misconceived statutes of the Lords of Misrule, to the superstition and stupidity of the masses who select, urge on, and support the Lords of Misrule. With freedom of press and mails the value of such a compend as this would be multiplied many times.

I.

Q.—What is sex?

A.—"The characteristic property by which an animal or vegetable is male or female." (WORCESTER.) Or, the reproductive property or properties which an animal manifests.

Q.—Is reproduction a form of growth?

A.—Yes; when a cell becomes so large that the feeding surface is too small to supply the mass of the cell with nourishment, the surface must be enlarged or the cell stop growing. The cell splits into two parts; "this is called reproduction by fission [or scission]. Where the cells after such division remain attached to each other, so as to form a composite body, as in plants, the increase of the body is *growth;* but where cells, after division, separate from each other and each piece goes on growing up to the mature size of the parent cell, it is growth to be sure, but it is interrupted and disconnected growth, or as it is usually expressed, *discontinuous* growth. But it is also reproduction, for it reproduces the parent cells and perpetuates the race." (ALEXANDER.)

Q.—What is this kind of reproduction called?

A.—Asexual; that is, without sex, or, more accurately, without specific organs of sex.

Q.—What forms of life reproduce in this way?

A.—"The lower forms of vegetation reproduce asexually by detachable bulbs or bulbils, or by fission, as some algæ, the liverworts, many ferns, some grasses, etc. Animals which reproduce by budding, or gemmation, or by fission, are asexual." (Alexander.) The tape worm is a common parasite that reproduces asexually.

Q.—What follows asexual reproduction?

A.—Sexual reproduction. "There has been such a differentiation [division of work] that, while all the parts continue to

grow by the asexual reproductive process of the cells of their own tissues, the possibility of reproducing all the tissues in a complete animal is not retained in every cell, but is transferred to certain specialized reproductive cells." (ALEXANDER.) The cells of one tissue can reproduce their own kind, but not the cells of another tissue. The reproductive cells themselves are subject to growth and division, like other cells. This is the asexual reproduction of these cells, considered merely as cells. The growth, both continuous and discontinuous, of the simplest animals, and of the simple tissues of the complex animals and plants, is asexual. But the reproduction of the body of the highly differentiated organisms is brought about sexually.

Q.—What is the condition of things under sexuality?

A.—Differentiation has proceeded so far that the reproductive cells have been still further differentiated, so that now one-half of them have lost one part of the reproductive function, which has been taken on by the other half, which, in turn, has lost another part of the reproductive function, taken on by the first half.

Q.—What is the result of this division of labor?

A.—The general reproduction of the organism can not proceed until two cells having these complemental fractions of functions can be brought together.

Q.—Was this differentiation an abrupt or a gradual process?

A.—Gradual. To quote a simple and direct description found in JAMES B. ALEXANDER'S "Dynamic Theory of Life and Mind": "In those asexual animals which are only so far differentiated as to have the reproductive cells distinct from those producing tissues, the reproductive cells are usually to be found together in one place and developing in connection with a special gland. And when sex differentiation begins, both kinds of sex cells are at first found developing in the same gland. Then the two kinds are developed alternately; the one kind at one period in the life of the individual, and the other kind at another time from the same gland. Then there are two glands, one for the development and keeping of the female cells, or ova, and the other for the male cells, or spermatozoa. Both these glands are at first in one individual and

near together; later they become separated in different parts of the same animal; and finally the female cells are found in one individual and the male cells in another. When both kinds are found in a single individual, it is called an *hermaphrodite* [in other words, it is *bi*-sexual]; when an individual has but one kind it is *uni*sexual. Among both plants and animals are to be found these three conditions as regards reproduction; viz., asexual reproduction, hermaphroditism, unisexuality. Most plants that we ordinarily meet are hermaphrodites, but a considerable number are unisexual, one plant bearing the fertilizing pollen, and another, the ovules, which when fertilized grow into the seed. The lowest plants are asexual like most of the lowest animals."

Q.—Are hermaphrodite individuals self-impregnating?

A.—Not as a rule, close observers declare. The chief reason is that the production of ova and spermatozoa does not take place simultaneously. Most bisexual animals live in the water; the spermatozoa and ova thrown off float about and drift to each other by accident, " or the spermatozoa are thrown off by one and find their way to the ova in or from the female glands of another." The pollen from hermaphrodite plants is carried about in the air or by insects and so finds its way " to the ovules in distant plants which may be ready for it."

Q.—How does this manner of fertilization lead to the development of unisexual plants and animals?

A.—" In cases where the male elements happen to be furnished by an exceptionally vigorous individual, and fall upon female elements of inferior vigor, or *vice versa,* the result must be organisms in which the equality of sex functions is disturbed, some individuals being more male than female, and *vice versa.* This sort of differentiation, carried to an extreme, results in the complete establishment of unisexuality in which one individual is the exclusive possessor of the male organs and another the female. Embryology proves that this is the process that has taken place." (ALEXANDER.)

Q.—What is the effect upon the strength and life of the parent of the differentiation of the sexual organs?

A.—It is to increase the chances of continued vigorous existence. Many simple organisms, both animal and vegetable, end their own existence when they have matured and liberated the elements which form the next generation. Numerous insects perish a few hours after the female has liberated the ova, "the exhaustion of reproduction being fatal to both female and *male.*" The more the rest of the body is differentiated from the reproductive cells, the less injuriously is it affected by the liberation of such cells. In the annelid Polygordius "the mature females break up and die in liberating their ova. This is approached but suggestively avoided in a genus of capitellid sea-worms (Clitomastus). The whole organism is not sacrificed, but only an abdominal portion of the body. This is, in fact, one of the key-notes to reproductive differentiation—the sacrifice is lessened and the fatality warded off." (GEDDES and THOMSON.) By the time man is reached the differentiation has proceeded so far that the liberation of reproductive cells, in the case of both male and female, not only is not injurious but is positively necessary to the continued health of the organism as a whole. When the reproductive cell was all there was of the organism its breaking up into two meant, of course, the death of the old and the substitution therefor of the two new organisms. But as the organism became more and more complex, as the functions of life were more and more divided among different organs, the less was the organism injured by the formation of new organisms from germs contributed by the old, or by the throwing off of the reproductive cells without the creation of new lives. Evolution has proceeded very far since the advent of the child or of the children carried with it the dissolution of the parent or of the parents. So far has it proceeded that it is now recognized by the most competent students of biology that the human female, as a rule, will have better health if she is the mother of a fair number of children than she will if she remain without offspring, while the conviction that frequent liberation of the ova and the spermatozoa is essential to the healthful working of the whole organism of the adult is strongest in the minds of those who have most fully familiarized themselves with

the evolution of sex. In fact, for a long period of years automatic nature itself forces this liberation periodically in the case of the female, except during lactation, and there is not lacking evidence to prove that too long-continued lactation is injurious. The liberation is also forced in the case of the male, but for various reasons the fact is not so obvious, especially as it lacks, more or less, the element of periodicity. However, this may be a lacking only in seeming, to the eye and thought of the careless. Careful observation, by conscientious scientific students, in this long tabooed field, is quite likely to show that there is a regularity of expressive activity not hitherto recognized. Dr. Havelock Ellis is one of the pioneers in this line of investigation. We reach the conclusion, compelled thereto by unprejudiced reflection reinforced by experience, that this liberation should be as nearly mutual as possible, in both time and degree, and that it will not, normally, be limited in time to the few days indicated. As highly differentiated unisexual animals, having complex and intense nervous systems, men and women complement each other in so many ways that the first and most important rule of living is the avoidance of solitariness in the liberation of reproductive cells. An essential corollary of this is that the sexes should be separated as little as possible at any time.

Q.—What is the least that can be said concerning the exercise of the various parts of the body?

A.—That exercise is necessary to health. The best-balanced organism is that in which the various parts all receive their needed exercise, in the most harmonious ratio. Activity and rest must alternate. If we have hard work for the muscles of the arm only one day in the year we must keep these muscles in a condition for doing good work when the time comes. This may be accomplished by engaging in pleasurable sports, in calisthenic drills, and in other exercises useful both because they keep the muscles ready for the prosaically hard labor that awaits them and because they *are* pleasurable. Use, not disuse, strengthens any part of our bodies. The brain of the thinker gathers power in activity, not in idleness. Proper rest does not imply rusting. Neither are years of rusting

years of strength-gathering. The suppression of faculties, either under the pressure of necessity or through obedience to a theory, disturbs the balance of the organism. The organism will yield in its weakest place, and nothing could be more unscientific than the assumption that the weakness of one part gives strength to the whole. The proposition is self-evidently untrue. The nervous miseries of women demonstrate the evil effects of suppression, for, as compared with man's, woman's is the sex that has made a fetish of the alleged duty of suppression. When rationalism shall have brought her back to her normal self and she has become, as a sex, as imperative in her demands as is man, as a sex—as are many women, to-day—she will have rid herself of most of the ailments and weaknesses "peculiar to her sex," and will be able to stand by her brother's side in conscious dignity and power, capable of enjoying this life as only persons in all-around good health can enjoy existence.

Q.—Are we to infer from your answer to the question preceding the last that it is desirable that the sexes assume the relation of lovers at a time when woman is commonly supposed to be incapacitated by reason of periodical sexual activity?

A.—Yes, assuredly; the question answers itself. The organism has unmistakably indicated what it requires. No less now than at other times are its commands to be obeyed. Hunger can be satisfactorily appeased in but one way. When we are cramped by sitting we get up and walk. When we are hungry we eat. When we are sleepy we sleep. Or, we do so when we have good sense, circumstances permitting. Necessarily, it scarcely needs to be said, the inevitable exceptions and degrees are to be noted, considered, and respected, for no blanket rule can be applied to all persons of one class or under similar conditions. And the woman is, rightfully, the deciding authority in all cases.

Q.—Are we to understand that play is "useful" only in so far as the muscles and organs it employs are thereby kept in a state of preparation for "necessary" work?

A.—No: Play is useful in itself; joy is positive, not negative. Pleasures that make us better satisfied with our fellows and less

disposed to invade the spheres of our associates, are always to be welcomed. Happiness has a direct effect upon the whole man or woman, and the effect is good, physically, intellectually, emotionally. It is the unsatisfied, unhappy man who is a torment to his neighbors. He is of use, of course, in helping the race advance to a better state, but the better state is preferable to the one it succeeds only because the chances of unhappiness in it are fewer. Freedom of life for the two sexes, the differentiation of the amative from the reproductive association, are destined to augment immensely the sum total of human happiness.

Q.—Why are the badly-mated man and woman not desirable elements in any community?

A.—Because they are not happy. Not being happy, they are likely to quarrel with each other, and, if they have children, to set them such an example of peevishness and hatred as to permanently sully the children's characters and thus handicap them fatally in the race of life. Unhappy persons are a source of disquiet to all with whom they come into close relations. Unhappy parents can not dower their offspring with those traits of disposition and that physical vigor and symmetry which would enable them to make the best use of their opportunities and contribute, in their turn, to the happiness of others. The sexually unfed man or woman is to that extent an undesirable factor in the community for the same reason that the pecuniary pauper is, or the deformed or the diseased person; neither of these is a full man or woman, and each helps lower the average of human pleasure, reducing the sum total of joys that should be ours and would be ours were we free from the dominion of the superstitions that buttress the most cruel and disastrous forms of spoliation and tyranny.

Q.—Is it true that the desire for pleasurable sensations is the cause of progress?

A.—Of course. Every fact of sentience, through all the gradations of organization, from the most simple to the most complex, demonstrates this truth. Growth is accretion through attraction; attraction draws together complementary atoms; the

joining of complements produces harmony, and harmony yields the sensations of pleasure. The fear of pleasure is the fruit of ignorance. All men want to be happy; they could not want to be anything else. But, for the most part, they do not know how to secure happiness. Nearly all have thought that the most happiness would come to them in some other world and that the best way to attain this future bliss was to be as miserable as they could be in *this* world. Hence the doctrine of self-sacrifice. Priests and kings and land-lords and money-lords, fattening in idleness while the millons wasted away in toil, always have extolled the beauties of renunciation, have preached against the "seductions of pleasure," the wickedness of "carnal delights." And the starving millions—poor fools—have generally swallowed the lie, too blind to see that their exploiters and tyrants failed to take their own medicine. Self-sacrifice is the antithesis of self-development. Self-sacrifice means decay and death; self-development means growth and life. The first is perversion, degeneration; the second is progression, generation, regeneration. Sick minds and sick bodies are not so helpful as well minds and well bodies. It is strange that at this late day it should be necessary to reiterate this truism. It is not a good thing to lack food for the stomach, the sex nature, the brain, the emotions, the æsthetic faculties. Waste is reduction of power, the diminution of pleasure. We must have plenty of nourishing food, and in such variety as is called for by the organs of assimilation, which represent the whole organism.

Q.—Returning to the particular subject of sex association, What is to be the rule of action, as you interpret the indications given by nature?

A.—The mutual desire of the two individuals who associate. One man can not decide for another nor one woman for another. No majority of men or of women or of men and women can decide for any minority. Differentiation is the road along which life marches; the forcible suppression of untried variations is always fraught with danger to the race, as it is likewise always an invasion of the individual. As I have previously said, evolution

has already differentiated the amative from the reproductive function. If we loved only when we desired to propagate and when we intended to propagate, one would love not more than an hour or so in the course of his whole life. If he expressed his love only when he intended to originate a new life he would express it not more than three or four times between puberty and death. As a matter of fact, however, the healthy man and woman desire to express their love thus thousands of times, and in many other ways, in the course of a long life. The censorship under which the stupidity of the masses permits the supernaturalist moralists to keep us renders it impossible to write and print and disseminate what should be written and printed and disseminated. The most that can be said here and now is that sexual attraction will be manifested differently by different individuals, by the same individuals at different times, and in both monogamic and varietist relations, even by the same individuals, in different periods of life. A *very* few virile persons may, perhaps, long abstain from association of one kind except when children are desired, but the overwhelming majority will find it imperatively necessary to express themselves fully quite frequently, and in varietist associations. If they do not do this, there will continue to be, as there is now, the involuntary or unsocial liberation of reproductive cells and nervous force which is the worst immediate result of attempted ascetic living. Concrete nature is stronger than theory, in the long run. The trend of evolution is toward wider and wider and more and more full expression of emotion. As we conquer the forces of the universe to our use, as we lengthen life by progressively limiting the number and intensity of diseases, and as we round out our natures by the development of the intellectual and æsthetic faculties, so we increase our capacity to enjoy pleasurable sensations, and therefore we shall ever strive to increase the number and prolificness of the sources of pleasurable sensation. This is why no theory of sexual denial long can be accepted, much less acted upon, by any considerable number of rational persons, who have good health.

Q.—"As man develops his attractions become more precise, and, where on the animal plane, his attraction was promiscuous,

on the perfected human plane a few only, and *ultimately* but one will attract and hold him sexually." Is this statement probably true?

A.—It is based upon a very one-sided study of the problem of sex attraction and repulsion. In the first place, touching the phraseology employed, we can not draw any sharp line between the "animal" plane and the "human plane," while as to a "*perfected* human plane," the words are unmeaning because perfection is unthinkable as regards finite beings. We might justifiably speak of an *improved* human plane if we were always careful to have it understood that "human" was not used in contradistinction to "animal," but was employed to indicate an animal more highly differentiated than the others. Again, it is not true that the attractions of animals of the lower orders are entirely promiscuous or varietist; some are monogamic, and more are partially monogamic, that is, some animals and birds go in pairs for one breeding season. So we perceive that no more here than elsewhere can we set the lower organisms on one side of a clearly-defined line and the more complex organism, man, on the other side.

Now as to the contention itself: It is true that as civilization advances men and women grow more particular in their attractions; in other words, something more than the mere difference of sex is required to draw them to one another. In still other words, a man of culture does not care for association sexually with *all* women, and a woman does not care for association sexually with *all* men. It may be said in passing that probably it has been a great many thousands of years since men and women began to have their preferences as to sex mates; that is to say, here and there a man or woman very early learned that some one of the opposite sex was more attractive than the others of that sex; differentiation was already doing its work in the mental and æsthetic domains of human life—there had ceased to be promiscuity for at least a few of the *genus homo*. And man was not the pioneer in sexual selection, as could easily be shown, if it were necessary. But the two fundamental errors of the objector are the making of promiscuity synonymous with variety (multi-selection), and the assumption

that increasing precision in selection will not be accompanied by increasing frequency of attractive attributes. Each of the errors is a glaring one. Promiscuity signifies without selection, while the varietist is of all men or women the most particular as to the qualities of the one loved, or the ones loved. The varietist requires the best for which his or her nature calls, and all of the best. The varietist is not satisfied to be chained for life to any one person, for there is not to be found in any one person the complement of all the qualities of one's self. The monogamist selects once, in a blind, hap-hazard way; the varietist continues to select all through life. The monogamist makes no allowance for changes of character in himself or his companion, for differences in development as the years pass, nor for the equilibration of attractions that is bound to come to every couple depending upon each other alone for magnetization and close mental and æsthetic companionship. In a word, the monogamist is promiscuous in his sexual relations, as he is not free to select from different persons what his nature requires. Opposed to him stands the varietist always selecting, under liberty, what his nature demands. If the laws, and the bad organization of society, deny the liberty essential to selection, the varietist does the best he can under the circumstances.

As to the second fundamental error of the critic, it is self-evident that he stopped his cogitations prematurely. It needs no argument to prove that, as men and women grow more particular as regards the qualities demanded in those they can love, so must there be a corresponding increase of the qualities in themselves which can be loved by men and women of equal mental power and equal refinement. The more there is asked for the more can be given. So demand and supply will keep pace with each other. As neither human perfection nor uniformity is supposable, the rationalist can not imagine a time to be coming in which a man will find in one woman all that he needs of the opposite sex, or a woman find in one man all that she needs.

Q.—Is it probable that where there is a strong sexual attraction a man and woman will be benefited as much by caresses and endearments which stop short of the full union of the two as they

would be by the completion of the association? Is it not possible that, on the contrary, they may be injured by such partial exchange?

A.—Where there is anything approaching a strong attraction sexually it is unwise to the verge of recklessness to permit any degree of intimacy unless it is intended to allow the attraction full play, with the consequent and imperatively necessary relaxation and rest, generally accompanied by somnolence, which follow natural association. Any partial caresses, under such circumstances, must result in a nervous shock that can not fail to be injurious. This does not carry the implication that the liberation of reproductive cells is demanded in each instance, for there may be strengthening interchange without, but liberation must not be too long deferred. Self-control is a great enhancer of power and almost infinitely increases the capacity for happiness, but this self-control will be lost if nature is defied instead of being guided.

For those who have weak attractive powers, whether the weakness is due to advancing years or to any other cause, there is no doubt that beneficial results will be secured without the complete association that to other and more fortunate individuals, men and women, is so necessary. Each must decide for him- or herself. Happiness is individual, not collective. It is only a convenient figure of speech to say that a nation is happy or prosperous. What is meant is that the individuals occupying a given territory are happy or prosperous. So to be happy in sex relations, "the people" must be happy individually, and to be happy individually it is essential that each be free to follow what is for him or her the line of least resistance. What is a moral or physiological "ought" for one is not for another who is organized differently or differently environed.

Q.—It is claimed by some vegetarians and advocates of abstinence from alcoholic liquors and tobacco that if we quit eating meat, drinking intoxicants, and using narcotics we shall in time cease to desire sexual association except for procreative purposes. What has sex rationalism to offer here? What is the basis of the theory?

A.—The basis of this theory is—theory. Most persons have a weakness for generalizing from here and there an isolated fact. They direct their gaze to one point and then jump to a conclusion for the whole world. If eschewing a meat diet will improve the general health of men and women, then their sexual nature must share in the benefit. If abstinence from intoxicants and narcotics is beneficial to man as an organism, it follows that the parts of the organism will be strengthened by that abstinence. Whatever tends to build up the body can not weaken a part of the body. For instance: I take a cold bath; *I* feel better at once. That is, as a whole, there is a change for the better in the organism. This is the result that living on food other than meat and abstinence from intoxicating liquors is supposed to produce. If the theory I am examining is sound, and if bathing is beneficial to the whole man, then after I bathe there should be a diminution of the demand for sex association. But the very reverse is the fact. Just as my brain works more harmoniously and expeditiously after a bath, so do all the other parts of the machinery. There is no exception to this, in my case. And others give the same testimony. Both experience and observation lead us to expect that the more healthful the food we take into our stomachs the stronger we shall be sexually, as well as otherwise. This increase in the healthfulness of our diet at once gives us greater power of control and greater capacity as well as desire for enjoyment. And this is because the whole organism is provided with an augmented reserve of strength.

In another view of the claim, we have to take into consideration many facts wholly lost sight of by the theorists. Note how prolific is the Irish peasantry, and the peasantry of many other countries, and the poor classes generally in the old world, as compared with the wealthy castes, and yet the poor people eat very little meat, relatively to the amount consumed by the rich. Rome conquered and raped the world with soldiers fed chiefly on parched grains. The Japanese has ever been one of the most warlike of people, but it remains to this day a very small consumer of flesh food. Going among the lower animals, we discover that a vege-

tarian diet does not always cool the blood. The amorous nature of the goat has made its name a synonym of lust, and yet the goat is not a meat-eater, nor does it drink wine and whiskey. The rabbit is another herbivorous animal, and one of the most prolific. So are many others of the non-meat eaters, while some of the carnivora breed very slowly.

Neither is it true that the man under the influence of intoxicants is always, or even in the majority of instances, ready to impose himself upon his wife or other women. Often the effects of alcohol upon him are such that he is for the time being incapacitated for sexual action. We are informed on good authority that the absinthe drinkers become in time dead to sexual feeling, and upon the whole, the abstainer seems to be capable of more intense and longer-continued enjoyment than does the user of strong liquors. While it is no doubt true that often the flagging energies of the sexually dissipated are stirred into temporary renewal of activity by stimulants, yet the final result is disastrous to the man or woman so spurring the jaded system. Reaction equals action, plus the friction, and so in the end the user of strong drinks is paralyzed rather than stimulated by the liquid whip applied to the rebellious flesh. In this view of the case we perceive how fallacious is the argument that temperance will reduce the sum total of sexual activity.

As to the assumption that the time is likely ever to come under any regimen when we shall desire sex association for the purpose of procreation, but shall not otherwise desire it, nothing could be more preposterous. We might just as well say that we shall at some time be hungry only when we want to build up a certain part of the body, that we shall not be hungry except for the attainment of this end. In other words, we shall be able consciously to control and direct the primary appetites of the organism. The Will will supersede attraction and repulsion. We shall be able to desire association only a very few times during life, but shall then so intensely desire it that we can call the atrophied organs into transient activity and give existence to strong and symmetrical children. That is the theory. Referring to the facts, this brief sum-

mary outlines the situation: So long as we retain the ability at any time to assist in the perpetuation of the species, we shall feel amative desire. While we feel that desire, we deny its full satisfaction at our peril. If the theorist contends that sexual attraction is the demand for children, and for nothing else, then I answer: Very well; act as you argue; obey "nature's command" and have a child once a year or oftener while the child-bearing period lasts. If it is "wrong" to associate for pleasure at the call of attraction, then it is equally wrong *not* to associate for procreation when "nature" orders you, by her messenger attraction, to have a child.

Q.—Is it desirable to have children come in such rapid succession?

A.—No; there is no necessity for wearing out the mother in that cruel way. A few children, and the best possible under the prevailing conditions, are what we need. It is not desirable that the race increase in numbers very rapidly. So improve the blood and the environment that the largest possible percentage of the children born survive to and through manhood and womanhood, and we have done the most that can be done to reform the world. Let the population increase slowly, so slowly that the men and women who live in the world will have clear heads and free hands for the thinking and the work that has to be done to remove the despots, destroy the monopolies, and drive out the superstitions that enthrall, rob, and debase humanity. Bad social conditions necessarily react upon the individual to his injury, but, on the other hand, bad social conditions require intelligent men and women for their elimination, and no "submerged tenth" has either the wisdom or the vitality necessary for the permanent reform of society.

Q.—How shall population be kept within the proper limits, supposing that the mothers are to be preserved from early exhaustion and to have the leisure and opportunity they need for culture and enjoyment?

A.—The people will learn how to prevent conception, and every woman who so wishes will have at hand the means whereby she can make her knowledge effective.

Q.—But how is this condition of intelligence and independence

to be reached, with the state and national governments united in a conspiracy to perpetuate the unfit and force unwilling motherhood upon the women of the country?

A.—There are some things that the strongest government can not accomplish. It has been tersely said that an entire people can not be indicted, and the hour is hastening when all the people of this country will know how to prevent conception. Once any large number of mothers begin to teach their daughters this vitally necessary science and art, the moralistic movement in favor of degeneracy will break itself into pieces against a stone-wall of popular *practical* disfavor. The people everywhere are asking about this matter; they have discovered that the prevention of conception is possible, and very many of them are testing some one or more of the methods now in vogue. What they want is the *best* method; while it is likely that moral and official stupidity will for some time to come balk their efforts to get it, the end is certain defeat for the champions of ignorance and legal outrage. The opponents of light long may continue to keep the mails locked and the express-car doors closed against the information the people are seeking, and they may put the freight carriers under surveillance of COMSTOCK, but they still are foredoomed to overthrow. The people are already passing this information from mouth to ear and the means of prevention from hand to hand. The first thing the opponents of knowledge will discover on awakening will be that the masses have in some way learned what it had been determined they should not learn. The restrictive laws will fall into desuetude, as have so many millions of other enactments intended to stay the sun of science in its course. The instruction I can not impart here or through correspondence will then be given to every boy and girl, and solitary injurious habits will be reduced to a minimum, in extent and volume. Exchange will take the place of nervous waste. There will be less distrust, less hate, less misery, fewer wrecks; there will be more confidence, more love, more joy, more well-rounded men and women; this will be a better world because a happier one.

Q.—Is not sexual disease due to varietist relations?

A.—Probably there never was a more stupid superstition than the one just indicated. Of course varietist relations disseminate the contagious diseases, just as general social intercourse disseminates the cholera, the bubonic plague, consumption, and all other diseases that spread through communities and from neighborhood to neighborhood. But are we proposing to destroy the present social arrangements and scatter men and women as hermits over the world so as to escape the ravages of infectious and contagious diseases? Such a "remedy" would be utterly impracticable, but no more impracticable than an attempt to stamp out sexual diseases by the enforcement of the monogamic ideal. Syphilis, introduced, probably, by the returning sailors of COLUMBUS into Europe during the closing years of the fifteenth century, spread with remarkable swiftness through all classes of society, lay and ecclesiastical. This fact shows how prevalent were illegal relations in Europe, and yet they had not resulted in the local development of the disease, uncleanly as were the personal habits of the people. From that time to this the terrible poison of syphilis has been coursing through the veins of the European peoples, disseminated by both contact and hereditary transmission. Whether in the first instance it was a filth disease, originating in the tropical or semi-tropical regions, or whether it owes its existence to a specific poison introduced into the system, like the virus of rabies, it is certain that filth has been largely responsible for its continued ravages throughout the world. The danger of contagion is always greatly aggravated by the carelessness of the victims and their poisoners. The prostitute class, recruited chiefly from the ranks of the very poor, whose women are so frequently compelled to choose between starvation and degradation, lacks the knowledge necessary to enable its members to observe the most simple sanitary precautions, while the heartless persecution of these unfortunates still further lessens their ability to take proper care of their persons. As an illustration of the evil effects of persecution, take the experience of Berlin in the Forties. DR. FR. J. BEHREND, in his "Die Prostitution in Berlin," points out that during the period of the suppression of the brothels (1845 to 1848, inclusive), the number of cases of syphilis

treated at Der Charite was trebled, while the disease invaded the best families. Dr. Parkhurst and other present-day crusaders would do well carefully to study the history of the Berlin experiment. Then, again, the poverty of the great majority of prostitutes compels them to accept men they know to be diseased. So the disease continues to spread, and will continue to spread while social and economic conditions remain as they are. With women industrially independent and both men and women intelligent enough to avoid danger of contagion, partly by keeping clean and partly by refusing to associate with the infected, the scourge would in time be conquered.

Q.—What civilized people has suffered the least from syphilis, and what are the causes of its comparative exemption?

A.—The Jewish people. One cause of exemption is circumcision. It lessens the danger of long retention of the poison received through contact. Another cause is the greater solidarity of the Jews. This cause operates through the wide-reaching system of mutual help which exempts their women from the necessity of adopting prostitution as a means of livelihood.

Q.—But there are other sexual diseases—what of them, from the viewpoint of social freedom?

A.—The milder sexual diseases probably are filth-diseases in their origin; certainly they have been perpetuated by contact with the contaminated and by unclean habits. There is not a scrap of evidence which goes to show that variety in love relations will of itself give birth to any sexual disease. Keep clean, keep away from those already diseased, and you are safe. And here social freedom comes in to play a most important part in the physical regeneration of the race. Give the young opportunity for the association which their natures imperatively demand; let it be understood that men and women of all ages may freely and without shame enjoy the affections of one or many as attraction leads, and the way is open for the return of the Prodigal Daughter and of the Prodigal Son. Women will not then be driven by shame into the ranks of the courtesans; women will not then go there because of the unsatisfied demands of their natures; men will not then buy sorrow and pain

and death of prostitutes and from them carry all these into their homes and the homes of other men. Give to labor its earnings and to love its liberty and Humanity is on the Open Road to an earthly future glorious beyond the dreams of all the heroes and poets of all the centuries.

Upward, upward press the peoples to that pure, exalted plane,
Where no throne shall cast a shadow and no slave shall wear a chain.
* * * * * * * * *
Then, despite the fangs of Custom and despite the Church's frown,
Womanhood shall wield its scepter, womanhood shall wear its crown.

She hath borne with man his crosses, she hath worn with man his chains;
She hath suffered all his losses, she hath suffered all his pains—
She shall stand with him, co-equal, on the pure, exalted planes!
—*Will H. Kernan.*

Q.—For the protection of women against undesired relations, is it neccessary, expedient, or just to resort to cruel, irremediable punishments?

A.—No; under social freedom the outraging of women will practically disappear. With voluntary associations recognized as the only honorable associations, and the consequent discouragement and elimination of law-sanctioned and law-protected invasion, the number of men who will not respect the initiative of women, will be very small. The proposal of certain statute-carpenters and pseudo sociologists to emasculate ravishers is a proposal to return to savagery. The objections to the scheme are many and weighty. In fact, no argument worth anything can be advanced in its favor. It is said by its advocates that "the punishment should be made to fit the crime." But it does not fit the crime. Rarely is the crime irremediable in its effects, while the vengeance we are urged to take is irremediable. Mutilation and the death penalty are alike repugnant to the sense of enlightened justice. If a man is convicted on false testimony and killed or mutilated, there is no redress for him, no hope for him, if the truth comes out later. And we know that many men have been convicted on false testimony. The charge

of outrage is one very easy to make, and one very hard to disprove, in many cases where there is not a word of truth in the accusation. Disappointed love or passion, malice, envy, hate, or avarice may inspire a woman to make a charge against a man that brings down upon him the indignation of all his fellows, even of the husbands who outrage their wives every night. Not a week passes that there does not somewhere occur an event of this kind. With imprisonment as the penalty for crime there is always, while the convicted man lives, hope for him if he was sent to prison on perjured testimony. But death closes the door against hope, and so does mutilation.

If the punishment should be made to "fit the crime" by the amputation of the offending member, why should not the hand of the pickpocket be severed from his arm? And the defaulter or the bank-wrecker, who alters the books and whose cunning forgeries carry misery into a hundred or a thousand homes, thus causing more suffering than scores of ravishments—why should not the instrument of *his* misdeeds be taken from him? And then there is the woman who falsely accuses a man of having outraged her and so ruins his life; why should not the punishment be "made to fit the crime," as "Liberty" suggests, by the cutting out of her tongue? Assuredly, there was more malice in her use of her tongue than there would have been in the act of the man had her story been true.

"Punishment" is an unscientific term, and no sociologist worthy of the name will advocate "punishment" for social offenders. All that we can wisely do is to protect ourselves in such ways only as will tend in the least measure to perpetuate the anti-social characteristics of the human animal. Cruel punishments, legal or extra-legal, invariably defeat the end sought. It is so in the case of rape where the penalty is death, life imprisonment, or a term of imprisonment which virtually amounts to life imprisonment. As a rule, where the law is the most severe, there is the greatest proportionate number of outrages. And to the crime of rape is added the crime of murder, very often, for the invader is determined to leave no witness behind to send him to the gallows, or to life incarceration. The same phenomenon was observed when the law punished simple

theft with death. Again: Should emasculation be made the penalty for outrage, we may be certain that juries will be far less likely to convict than they do now, just as murderers are often turned loose because the juries hesitate to send men to the judicial shambles. Then the mob cries for vengeance and Judge Lynch executes the barbarous law with all the added cruelties that the mad impulses of emotional and alcoholic intoxication can devise. The mob kills or mutilates—the same thing in effect—and then tries, if it tries at all.

Really, the emasculation propagandists have their eyes on the "purity" standard rather than on the scales of justice. They are fighting for a high age-of-consent, in many States, and they want to visit the most fearful vengeance upon the male violaters of their absurd statutes, no matter how willing the young women concerned were to enter into the association that the age-of-consent enactments brand as rape. We know what are the forces that underlie this movement toward Spanish judicial methods, the methods of savage torture. Already some of the less cautious emasculation propagandists have placed themselves on record in favor of the same cruel penalty for "adulterers" and the "seducers" of mature women. Aiming ostensibly at the ordinary ravisher (outside of legal marriage), the "purity" champions of emasculation intend to ultimately bring down the practical sex rationalist. Of course they are opposed to non-legal invasion, but non-conformity is at least equally repugnant to them. Many of them hate it worse. Their attitude toward the Mormons proves this conclusively.

II.

Q.—What is the cause of the shame of sex which is so generally felt by Christians and by others who have come under the influence of the Christian religion, or of related religions?

A.—Other-worldliness; the shame of sex is the survival of that all-inclusive shame and distrust of all things earthly which were the central dogmas of the Buddhist ascetics, of the Essenian ascetics, and later of their descendants and heirs, the Christian ascetics.

Jesus taught that this world is the kingdom of Satan, and because of their allegiance to the "prince of this world" the inhabitants of the earth hated and rejected the "son of God." Says HITTELL ("History of the Mental Growth of Mankind in Ancient Times," IV., 312), quoting from MATTHEW, LUKE, and JOHN: "As the world does not love righteousness, so no righteous person can love the world. 'If,' says Jesus, 'any man...hate not...his own life...he can not be my disciple'; and again he said, 'He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.' On another occasion he told his hearers that 'if any man will come after me, let him deny himself,' 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.' 'Blessed are ye when men shall hate you,...for behold your reward is great in heaven.' 'Woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall mourn and weep.' According to the New Testament, this life is a mere antechamber of another to come hereafter. It is brief, and the other is eternal. It is a place of probation and the other of fruition. It is base, and for the saints the other is glorious. The chief duty of man on earth is to qualify himself for heaven by acquiring righteousness, which includes faith, acceptance of baptism, obedience to Christian priests, and the observance of the ascetic rules laid down by Jesus."

MASSILLON, the eminent French Jesuit, logically amplifies his master's doctrines in this way (III., 6): "Whether we consider worldly prosperity by the impression which it makes on the heart to corrupt it, or by the facilities which it offers for the gratification of the passions, when the heart is already corrupt, we must admit that salvation is so difficult in this condition of felicity and abundance that the righteous man should regard worldly prosperity as a present which God usually gives to men who are to be the victims of his wrath. ...A Christian soul should live as a stranger on this earth; his origin, as TERTULLIAN says, his home, his hope, his nobility, his crown, are in heaven; and his heart ought to be where his treasure is. If it ceases for one moment to sigh for its country, it

ceases to belong to the future age and to the church of the first-begotten; if it takes pleasure in its exile, it is no longer worthy of its inheritance. Its desire makes here below all its piety; its anxiety makes all its merit; it should have all its consolation in its hopes. But this disposition, so essential to the faith, is effaced by the first impression made by prosperity on the heart, the impression of attachment to the earth. ...It is difficult to be displeased when everything smiles upon us; to regard a world of delights as a place of exile; to give all our thoughts to another world when this one seems to belong to us; ... to groan like the prophet, about the tediousness of our pilgrimage, when we do not feel its toils or its worries; and to long for the other life, while this one tempts us with its enchantments. ... If you ask what there is wrong in the disposition to enjoy the world, ... I reply with ST. AUGUSTINE, that if your desires could control your fate, you would live forever on the earth; you would accept as a favor the privilege of living eternally in material pleasures, far from God; if you could obtain this world for a perpetual home, you would not pray for another."

In another place, (III., 2), MASSILLON gives us this ascetic sermon: "A Christian is the child of the promises, a man of the future existence, a citizen of heaven, a portion of Christ, a person who longs without ceasing for his reunion with this mystical body, a person who advances every day towards spiritual perfection, and will never reach it until he arrives at his celestial home." "Faith teaches us that we are detestable; for there is nothing lovely save the celestial order which we have violated; there is nothing lovely save truth and justice which we have deserted; there is nothing lovely save the work of God, and we are the work of sin. Therefore, we should hate ourselves; otherwise we would be unjust and would contradict the liveliest sentiments of our consciences." "The gospel has no anathemas save for those who would receive their gratifications in this life. Everywhere woe is predicted for those who laugh and are satiated; everywhere the promises of consolation are made only to those who suffer here below; everywhere the present world is delivered to the sinners as their possession and their inheritance; everywhere the recompenses of the saints on earth

are tears and afflictions; and everywhere, finally, their kingdom is not of this world." CALVIN, JONATHAN EDWARDS, and other representative Protestants agreed heartily with the gospel as preached by the Catholic MASSILLON.

HITTELL (IV., 317) further remarks: "In the synoptical gospels Jesus is represented as the teacher of a system of ascetic morality similar to that of the Buddhist monks, but, unlike the strict code of Siddartha, it is addressed not to a small class of mendicant celibates but to the whole world. It is imposed upon all believers equally; there is no exception for age, sex, or condition of life. It occupies nearly all the space given to the teaching of morals in the sayings attributed to Jesus. He says: 'Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven.' 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.' 'Woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation.' 'Whosoever he be that forsaketh not all that he hath, he can not be my disciple.' 'Blessed be ye that hunger now, for ye shall be filled.' 'If any man will sue thee at law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' 'And whoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.'" There is a great deal more of the same kind.

Q.—What was the attitude of Jesus and of the church nearest to him towards sex association?

A.—I can most tersely answer by another quotation from HITTELL, which includes a number of texts from the Bible: "In regard to matrimony Jesus said: 'They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection of the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage.' 'Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee pluck it out.' 'There be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.' 'It is better for thee to enter life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where the worm dieth not.' ... The highest saints in the heaven of Jesus are celibate men, as we are told in the following

passage of Revelation: 'A lamb stood on the Mount Sion, and with him a hundred and forty and four thousand, wearing his father's name written in their foreheads. . . . These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. They are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first fruits unto God and the Lamb.' The plain meaning of these passages is that celibacy is important if not indispensable to the righteousness of Jesus. The first quotation . . . means that they who are worthy of salvation do not marry in this life; and is in complete harmony with the subsequent quotation from the language of Jesus, and with many in the epistles of PAUL, who said, 'It is good for them [the unmarried] if they abide [remain] even as I [in celibacy.] . . . He that is married careth for the things that are of this world. . . . The unmarried careth for the things of the Lord.' (I. Cor. vii 8, 33, 34). Jesus himself never married, and, according to the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church, PETER put away his wife. That church imposes celibacy on its clergy, and ascribes a higher condition of righteousness to its priests and to the members of its celibate orders, than to the married laity. JEROME, who is a very high authority among the Roman Catholics, says that 'matrimony fills the earth, but celibacy replenishes heaven.'" (IV. 320-21).

Q.—Do the self-assumed disciples of Jesus now generally observe the ascetic regulations of their religion?

A.—No; they openly disregard every precept, except, as previously indicated, those relating to sex; these they pretend to obey where they are members of celibate societies—not otherwise. But the poison of the old teachings has weakened their intelligence and corrupted their morals to such a degree that they think their sex functions are degrading to their manhood and womanhood, and so their lives are greatly at variance, in a vast number of instances, with their professions, while wherever the influence of the ancient superstitions is felt, men and women and children are ashamed of the cause of their existence. How the lives of Christians contradict the teachings of the "master" and his ascetic prototypes, it may be

salutary to show here by a few more paragraphs from MR. HITTELL'S work:

"The Christian who wishes to act in accordance with the moral teachings of the gospel must renounce all the pleasures of the world. He must have no wealth, no luxury, no fine clothing, no elegant dwelling, no political authority, no wife, no anxiety save that for his eternal salvation. He should become a hermit or monk; he should govern himself always by the rules of poverty, chastity, and submission. He should remember the command, 'Resist not evil.' He must stay away from the theater, from the dance, and from the concert, and must even abstain from all jovial company. Jesus says to him, 'Let your communication [conversation] be yea, yea; nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil'; and again he says, 'Every idle word that men speak they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment.'

"These commands are explicit and are not abrogated or qualified by other passages not here quoted. If they were ever authoritative for anybody, they are now in full force for everybody. They have been interpreted literally and made a rule of life by millions of Christian monks; and that they were meant to be taken literally is proved by the fact that similar rules had been adopted for centuries before the time of the evangelists by the Essene and Buddhist ascetics.

"The average Christian of our time says these ascetic maxims are not addressed to him. He must say something of this kind to excuse the discord between his conduct and the gospel precepts which he pretends to make the rule of his life. He loves the world. He respects humanity. He believes in progress. He is proud of his freedom. He protects his rights at the risk of his heart's blood. He delights in the pleasures of love, of wealth, of intellectual companionship, of the fine arts, and of many forms of luxury. He wants an excellent table, elegant clothing, a commodious dwelling, good books, dramas, musical entertainments, and social gatherings of many kinds. He will not give up all his worldly possessions and go out with a single garment, preaching the gospel. Between the

position of Dives and that of Lazarus, he prefers the former with all its certainties in this world and its chances in the next.

"Christians generally, as their habits prove, put a very liberal interpretation on the ascetic maxims of Jesus. They understand them to mean, first, Do not mutilate yourself; second, marry; third, accumulate property; fourth, do not sell it and divide the price among the poor; fifth, live in luxury if you can; sixth, when a man smites you on one cheek, knock him down; seventh, if a man steal your coat, send him to jail; eighth, resist evil; ninth, avoid people who do not laugh and who limit their conversation to yea, yea, and nay, nay; and tenth, enjoy yourself, love this life, do not worry about another, and deal justly here.

"To persons not familiar with orthodox Christian literature, this method of interpretation may seem disrespectful to WEBSTER'S Dictionary, but it is in accordance with the long established and general custom of commentators in high repute. The ethical works of Roman Catholic and of Protestant theologians, including such men as PALEY and LIGUORI, will be found to agree substantially with the interpretation in the preceding paragraph." (IV. 321-23).

I have quoted somewhat beyond the proper limits of my space because it was necessary to lay bare the anti-natural and debasing sources of the now prevailing fear of sex, to make clear the truth that the people of to-day can not really abide the ascetic notions of the desert recluses, although they pretend to think those notions inspired and holy, and to call serious attention to the hypocrisy of the moralists who are ever ready to let loose the ravening hounds of public hatred and of legal persecution against whoever has the hardihood to say that sex is to be accepted without shame and enjoyed without guilt.

Q.—What relation have the ascetic teachings of Jesus and his predecessors and successors to the present deplorable condition of opinion and practice in the realm of sex?

A.—They have very largely the relation of cause to effect. Whatever tends to make people contented with this world is bad, according to the theory of the other-worldians. Sex and its pleas-

ures, from the delights of lovers to the joys of parents, are the most seductive of earthly temptations; for these blisses men and women may well barter their hopes of heaven, for them they may well smother their fears of hell. So it has come to pass that the distrust of sex has survived in the lands where the gospel has been carried; the knowledge that men and women would prefer this world with love to a chance of a heaven after death has made the priesthoods of Christendom the perpetual libelers of the sweetest of passions. They have made not only devout believers ashamed of the agency of life but they generally have been successful in holding so-called Freethinkers as worshipers at the altar of ascetic corruption. The terrible blunder which led the anti-naturalist to depreciate earth in order to enhance the value of heaven in the eyes of his disciples was one of the most costly mistakes ever made by man. As MR. HITTELL has so lucidly shown, the influence of Eastern asceticism had become almost *nil* in the West, so far as nearly all the non-sexual affairs of rational people were concerned, until the end-of-the-century recrudescence of mysticism, but he could have rendered the cause of truth a still greater service than he has if he had pointed out how the hypocrisy of those millions who formally accept a creed which they do not attempt to put into practice in every-day business, pollutes every relation of life, and how our present sex associations are debased by the old gospel falsehoods and uncounted numbers of men and women cast upon the rocks of hopeless disaster by the misleading lights still burned by cleric and moralist in obedience to the ignorant instructions of their legendary guides.

Q.—Can there be fearless investigation of the problem of sex, untainted enjoyment of the delights of love, candor in the expression of convictions, harmony of beliefs and actions, and just dealing with those loved, if men are slaves to the delusions that their hopes of eternal bliss are dependent upon their renunciation of happiness in this world and that the organs and acts which perpetuate the race are shameful and destructive of purity and holiness?

A.—No; in a society where such sentiments prevail there will be no general accurate knowledge of the most important facts, the

springs of human joy will be poisoned, hypocrisy and cowardice will be almost universal, there will be a constant and agonizing struggle between belief and desire, between theory and life; and deceit, trickery, and treachery will characterize the love and sexual relations of men and women. It is a reasonable assumption that this will be so, and the assumption is proved to be absolutely unassailable, by both the records of history and the facts of our own experience and observation. The ascetic doctrine has been an unmitigated curse to mankind, a veritable "Asiatic mildew." How vain has been the mad attempt to force the Eastern creed of physical and emotional emasculation upon the life-abounding and life-loving West is well told by ELLA WHEELER in the words which she puts into the mouth of Clarimonde:

> Adieu, Romauld! But thou canst not forget me.
> Although no more I haunt thy dreams at night,
> Thy hungering heart forever must regret me,
> And starve for those lost moments of delight.
>
> Naught shall avail thy priestly rites and duties—
> Nor fears of Hell, nor hopes of Heaven beyond;
> Before the Cross shall rise my fair form's beauties—
> The lips, the limbs, the eyes of Clarimonde.
>
> Like gall the wine sipped from the sacred chalice
> Shall taste to one who knew my red mouth's bliss,
> When Youth and Beauty dwelt in Love's own palace,
> And life flowed on in one eternal kiss.
> * * * * * * * * *
> Yet, for the love of God, thy hand hath riven
> Our welded souls. But not in prayer well-conned,
> Not in thy dearly purchased peace of Heaven,
> Canst thou forget those hours with Clarimonde.

Again, in "Ad Finem";

> A lighter sin or a lesser error
> Might change through hope or fear divine;
> But there is no fear, and hell has no terror
> To change or alter a love like mine.

So the perpetual conflict between earthly happiness and heavenly "duty" has torn the hearts and racked the brains of men and women through the dark, sad centuries of asceticism. It is full time that that needless and disastrous conflict ceased. Let us forever be done with the foolish condemnation of that force, of those functions, without which we could not *be,* either to make the most of our mother earth or to blindly sacrifice her opportunities in the delusive hope of compensation in ghostland. Let us cease to be ashamed of what makes us men, of what makes us women, of what gives us the kisses of lovers and the encircling arms of babes. Let us look at sex honestly, candidly enjoying it, fearlessly enhancing its joys, pitying while correcting its mistakes, hesitating not to gaze upon it as it stands naked in the electric light of outer nature and of human experience.

Q.—Is sex openly manifested in the forms of life lower in the scale than man?

A.—It is; wherever there is sentience there is sex; that is, there is to be found—whether in the simplest method of propagation, fission, or in the intermediate methods between that and unisexual propagation, or in the last—the palpable evidence of the presence of that force of reproduction which mysticism and asceticism have derided, contemned, and misused. Ocean, air, and land teem with the fruits of sex. We find sex in the valley and on the mountain-top; on the prairie and in the forest. Everywhere it reproduces the old; everywhere it gives birth to the new. We walk in the garden, in the cultivated field, in the wild wood, over the steppes, by the river, along the marge of the sea—all about us is sex; it is present to the ear, to the eye, to the nostril, to taste, to the touch. Its organs, its manifestations, its germs, all force themselves upon our attention. Its music rings in the wooing song of the bird, it vibrates from the wing of the insect, it shrills defiance from the throat of chanticleer, it roars out its bass in the bellow of the bull. Its multicolors glow in the flowers and are stamped on hair and fur and feather. On every side valiant knights of the vegetable and animal kingdoms list in the tournaments of love, where sex meets sex and the joy is alike for victor and for vanquished. Upon our hands and

garments drops the prodigal pollen of tree and shrub and cereal; under our careless feet we trample cell and seed. Here are ever open to the sun the loving toil and the beauties of sex; mock modesty comes not to make prudes or hypocrites of the foolish; here is no shame-prompted concealment of the instrumentalities whereby matter is perpetually given new forms useful and fair, loving and lovable each to its kind, for here there is no priest to preach contempt of earth and longing for impossible heavens while he fattens on the offerings of his poor dupes.

Q.—Is sex an important factor in human endeavor and accomplishment?

A.—It is one of the most important, if not *the* most important. The necessity for food, raiment, and shelter induces all, even the savage, to put forth a certain amount of exertion, sufficient to maintain life at a dull level of enjoyment, but it is love that inspires to heroic endeavor, that spurs men and women on in the pursuit of wealth, fame, learning and power; that overcomes seemingly insurmountable obstacles, and that opens the way for leisure, for science, for art, for literature, for every form of culture. Love is in the sword of the liberator, in the measures of the poet, in the notes of the singer, in the brush of the painter, in the cunning of the inventor, in the eloquence of the orator, in the struggles of the reformer, in the adventurous daring of the explorer. Abject indeed is he in spirit, narrow is he in thought, famine-stricken is he in sympathy, who does not find in love the stimulus that lifts him to the greatest altitudes he ever reaches, that sustains him under misfortunes, and adds tenfold to the pleasures of prosperity. What will *he,* what will *she* think of this sentence, of this witticism, of this book, of this picture, of this deed of courage, of this invention, of this product of my hand—*that* is the question that is ever shaping itself in the brain of the lover, and which in all ages and lands while the race remains will do more than all laws, all institutions, and all religions to give freedom, enlightenment, and happiness to the generations which are to come. Nothing can be more foolish than to depreciate sex, to make it appear as a thing of shame, to set it in the market-place for sale, and to cover it with the filthy rags

of convention. Very literally, love is life. As life must be free to be at its best, so must love be free, for free life is inconceivable without free love.

Q.—What is immodesty?

A.—Non-conformity. In all ages, at all times, among all peoples, he or she is immodest who does not follow the local customs in dress or the absence of dress. Whatever law, fashion, climate, religion, or occupation makes the ordinary dress is the modest dress, in that tribe, caste, or nation. Hence, affirmatively, modesty is conformity. "In the valley of the Orinoco, the woman is immodest who appears among strangers without a coat of paint. An aboriginal girl there, to please a European visitor, put on a gown, but when some of her tribe appeared she was much abashed and threw off the gown hastily." (HITTELL, I. 153).

Q.—What is the savage estimate of nudity as related to modesty, and what are some of the tribal differences of custom?

A.—"Among savages generally the sentiment that nudity is immodest, if not absolutely lacking, is very weak. In tropical climates throughout the year, and in temperate regions, in the hot season, the children who have not arrived at puberty are nearly all naked, and so are the adults in Tasmania, parts of Australia, the Pelew, Mariana, and Torres islands, and among the Ovambos, Batokas, Obongos, Bubes, Lufiras, Wakambas, Kaironoos, Goldas, Botocudos, Orinocos, Arowaks, Tapajos, Puris, and Coroados of both sexes. To distinguish himself from his subjects, the chief of the Musgas wears clothes. The men of Shir, Neuhr, Bari, Mahenge, New Caledonia, and California and the Maori warriors, on military expeditions, are nude and so are the married women of Ganguella, Watusi, Uape, Congo, and parts of Australia and Melanesia, and the *un*married women of Fan, Dor, Neuhr, Dinka, Shillook, Ashira, Obbo, Tupi, Guaype, and parts of Australia and South America. The Madombe bride, without any clothing save a coat of whitewash, calls on her friends to announce her approaching marriage." (HITTELL, I. 153. See also MONTEIRO, 187; KLEMM I. 302.) As generally among savages the wife is expected to be more circumspect in her conduct than is the girl, she has to be more care-

ful how she clothes herself. "In Fiji, the only dress of the marriageable girl is a girdle with fringe three inches long; of the childless wife a foot long; of the wife with a child, a foot and a half long. The savage woman usually wears no clothing above the waist in warm weather, and a small motive induces her to throw off that below the waist. Thus if she has to walk across a stream where she will be splashed, she takes it off. A Kaffir girl in a mixed company received a present of a new dress, and immediately took off the old one, so that she could put on the new one. In many tribes the women are dressed while away from home or at home entertaining visitors, and nude at other times. The most common feminine garment is a fringe girdle, the fringe, from three to eighteen inches long, consisting of flags, reeds, strips of bark, twine, or leather thongs. If beads are procurable, they are much prized for decorating this simple but important article of apparel. . . . The Wahehe woman wears a string of beads around her waist with a tail hanging down behind; and it would be highly unbecoming for her to go into company without the tail. The Watuta, Wanyuema, Shillook, and Vate women have string girdles with an apron or fringe in front and a tail behind, and the tail should be longer than the appendage in front. The dress of the obscurely fair sex in the Apono and Ishogo tribes consists of two pieces of cloth, one on each side of the body from the armpits to the knees. These pieces must meet behind; whether they meet in front or not is less important. The Dor women comply with the requirements of modesty, as they understand it, by wearing a little twig hanging down in front from a string girdle. An apron six inches square attached to a similar girdle suffices for the married women of Fan, Shir, Bari, Monbutto, Mundruca, and some New Guinea tribes." (HITTELL, I, 154.)

Q.—Was the introduction of clothing in any degree due to the desire to ornament the person or to appear distinguished?

A.—Yes, that desire had much to do with the adoption of clothing, with the various kinds invented, and consequently with the establishment of the customs that came to have more than the force of law for the members of tribes and the citizens of nations. In fact, it is probable that in the tropical countries clothes

were at first worn neither as a protection against the inclemencies of the weather nor from a sense of shame. As instanced in the foregoing quotations, in the case of the Musgus, chiefs wore certain garments to distinguish them from the common herd, as they wore headdresses of feathers and other materials, arranged their hair in a different way, and carried about on their persons more beads, metals, stones, and other crude ornaments than the rank and file could afford or were permitted to wear. In some tribes the woman wears from twenty to seventy-five pounds of anklets, bracelets, collars, and body bands, consisting of beads, brass, and iron. A coat of paint may be a symbol of rank, or merely the dress ordered by custom. In many tribes the man is not in fashion unless he has numerous scars on his body. An almost infinite number of mutilations are fashionable, some in one tribe and some in another. Heavy rings are worn in the ears, the nose, the lips, and pendent from other parts of the body. One of the most suggestive of the discoveries of travelers is that some tribes ornament the very parts that modern modesty decrees shall always be hidden, and this ornamentation is for the purpose of calling attention to those parts, so that we see that here dress was invented to reveal rather than to conceal. This custom survives in the " full dress " of fashionable society.

Q.—But is it true that custom determines the modesty or immodesty of apparel to-day in civilized countries?

A.—Yes. It is considered shameful for men (except priests and some judges) to wear the flowing garments of women, and for women to wear the garments of men, and such substitution is generally an offense against the law. Both men and women can wear at the seashore clothes that would cause their arrest if they appeared in them on the streets of the city. It is fashionable for women to reveal the lower parts of their bodies in the surf and the upper part at the ball and opera, while the opposite procedure would be regarded as scandalous to a degree beyond the power of words to express. If you should inadvertently come into the presence of your woman acquaintance when she was in her own house and dressed as she was the day before

when she coquetted with you on the sands, she would flee from your sight in dire confusion. In this and the European countries the most modest of women will show her face in public, but in Turkey and others of the Eastern countries, that act would be so shameful as to merit condign punishment. Here, at the behest of fashion, too many clothes are worn, or too few; enough to overheat the body, or not sufficient to protect it from cold and damp; the vital organs are constricted, the figure deformed by hideous contrivances that do credit to their savage prototypes, and the attention of the on-looker particularly challenged for the very parts that "morality" asserts should be never seen by any but the husband and never spoken of above a whisper. Any attempt to make woman's dress more healthful and comfortable is lampooned by the cheap wits of the press, moralized against by the Dry-as-Dusts, preached against by most of the ministers, sneered at by the dowagers of fashion, and made the quarry of the notoriety hunters of "reform" and of legislation. Even as I write, in this year of Christian grace, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, bills are pending in several legislatures making it a misdemeanor for any woman to appear in public astride a bicycle, or wearing bloomers, knickerbockers, short skirts, or shirt waists! And a woman is at the head of a society which is urging on these jacks-in-office in their reactionary crusade! (Date of first edition.)

Q.—What has sex rationalism to say affirmatively concerning nudity and clothes?

A.—That such garments are to be worn as may be necessary to secure the comfort of the body. That outside the privacy of our own apartments, when we are compelled to sacrifice comfort to avoid disastrous encounters with the law or to escape the odious attentions of the mob, we can do no better than submit, but should take care to enter our protests whenever protests give promise of accomplishing any good result. We will teach our children, by precept and example, that for us clothes are useful just in the ratio that they permit freedom of motion and secure the proper conditions of warmth. We will say to them that nudity

is as natural as breathing, and as innocent. When no superstitious persons are present, they will be encouraged to get all the air-baths and sun-baths possible, which are as wholesome as water-baths, and as necessary. From their earliest infancy the children will learn from observation that the human body is in all its parts free to be studied, whether it is the body of a man or a woman or a child. They will not know what it is to be ashamed of the nude unless they learn the evil lesson from the religionists of the outside world, and when they do we will take all the pains we can to neutralize this poison of supernatural moralism.

Q.—You have referred to surf-bathing, and that calls up the subject of the relation of bathing to dress—what is gained by wearing clothes in the water?

A.—Nothing, except, perhaps, immunity from blistering when one is long exposed to the sun when it is shining fervidly. But inasmuch as it is not desirable to remain long in the water at one time, it is probable that it would be better even in outdoor bathing to discard all garments. This, of course, is advice for the most tender of civilizees only; for persons of even ordinary robustness of constitution clothes are not needed in any kind of bathing, and they are a nuisance having not one redeeming feature. Bathing-garments are the invention of prudery, and are likely to be kept in use indefinitely by the disciples of Mrs. Grundy in alliance with the unfortunates who have poor figures or blemishes of the flesh. In Japan, women, men, and children have bathed together nude for centuries, if not from time immemorial, without damage to morals or health. Now, however, they are slowly succumbing to the corrupting modesty of the Christian nations, and it is to be feared that ere long they will be as shame-faced and debased as we are. Except in public bathing-places, the children of radicals, and radicals themselves, will not be hampered by clothes when they take their baths. If they want their clothes cleansed they will send them to the laundry or the renovator, for garments can not satisfactorily be attended to when on the human body.

Q.—What is the attitude of ascetism toward nudity in art?

A.—That of bitter opposition, of uncompromising enmity.

The painting or statue of the nude is contemplated with outward horror by the Puritan, whatever may be the real effect it has upon him. He rails against all art which is approximately true to life—we have no recognized art that is not partly a compromise with convention—as the most pernicious of the devices of his devil; he calls it "vile," "corrupting," "indecent," "degrading," "insulting to womanhood," "vicious," "obscene," "sinful," "sensual," "lewd," "the representation of a corrupt heathen mythology"; in a word, over the most beautiful creations of the painter's brush, over the "living, breathing marble" of the sculptor's chisel, he daubs the filthy pigments of his own imagination, and then triumphantly calls upon us to behold how dirty and debasing are the pictured canvas and the hewn stone! He is the enemy of the unexpurgated man and woman, of the lovely naked child, of nature without the loin-cloth of the savage. He incites the fanatic mob to burn the paintings of the nude that hallow the homes of the rich and the galleries of art; he invokes the aid of the politicians and from these spoilers of their fellows he obtains laws that put true art under the ban—that station the spies of the most vicious of meddlers in the post-offices of the people and at the doors of the art stores and of the studios; he is happy when one of the minions of these vicious purity mongers bribes some poor artist to paint the figure of a woman on a sea-shell or a bit of glass and then arrests and drags away to jail the victim of his seductions; he glories in the mental slavery, the moral confusion, and the physical servitude, that permit the ascetic surveillance of the art and literature of the American people, and he grows more and more insolent as greater and greater power is given into his hands by dullards on the one side and their represenatives on the other.

Q.—What sort of argument does the Puritan advance in favor of the veil of immodesty and its law-compelled wearing?

A.—His arguments are of all arguments the most silly. As a fair sample of them, read this excerpt from a decision of Judge PHILLIPS, of the United States Circuit Court:

> There is in the popular conception and heart such a thing as

modesty. It was born in the Garden of Eden. After Adam and Eve ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, they passed from that condition of perfectibility which some people nowadays aspire to, and, their eyes being opened, they discerned that there was both good and evil; "and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons." From that day to this civilized man has carried with him the sense of shame, the feeling that there were some things on which the eye, the mind, should not look; and where men and women become so depraved by the use, or so insensate from perverted education, that they will not veil their eyes, or hold their tongues, the government should perform the office for them in protection of the social compact and the body politic.

That is one of the most perfect mixtures I have ever seen; it is compounded in exactly equal proportions of the inanity of superstition and the impudence of irresponsible power. In it we have misrule based on myth. Judge PHILLIPS seeks to erect an edifice of usurpation on a foundation of primitive ignorance. He assumes that we have no right to gaze on the unclothed human body, to speak of the facts of sexual physiology, and he proposes that whoever does look or speak shall be punished in the name of the "social compact," of the "body politic," which are two more fictions. His assumption has its source in discredited legends and his intention is the purpose of the despot. This argument of the federal judge is as good a one as was ever formulated against the naked truth, in body and word, and as no better could be made, the sensationalist, DWIGHT L. MOODY, quotes it in a long diatribe of his own against art, which was printed in the New York "Sunday Journal" of January 31, 1897. The excerpt is taken from the decision of Judge PHILLIPS in the cause of "The United States *vs.* HARMAN," 45 F. R., 423.

Q.—Will the children of consistent sex rationalists be taught that the nude in art is innocent?

A.—If such teaching is necessary to counteract any pernicious ascetic notions which they may imbibe "in the world." But wise parents and guardians will simply assume the perfect innocence of the artistic representations of the nude, just as they will assume the innocence of the unclothed body. That the human figure should be painted on canvas and represented in marble and bronze

just as it is the child will take for granted unless his mind is poisoned by the moralism of the Puritan. To be sure, even artistic masterpieces themselves may plant the seeds of asceticism in the mind of the child, for art has partly surrendered to Grundy; it did that long ago, and no artist is brave enough to break through the fences of precedent in anything that he paints for public exhibition. No sculptor of this age, so far as I am aware, dares to reproduce the human body faithfully. Every picture or statue is conventionalized in one way or another. The bright boy or girl, who has seen the body of the adult man and woman, must perceive that in the painting and statue there is something lacking. The senseless omissions challenge wonder and inquiry and help create the demand for the less artistic but truer representations which are so eagerly sought by young and old alike, among those who have been educated by the orthodox moralists. Sex rationalists will explain to their children that the omissions they have noticed are due to stupid adherence to a precedent, and that no valid reason can be found for this persistence in misrepresentation.

Q.—Has asceticism invaded literature?

A.—Yes; because of its incursions our literature is a sham, a lie, a shameful parody of the truth. It is not a faithful transcript of the human mind and an accurate picture of human life. It evades, conceals, falsifies outright. It is tame, stupid, silly, misleading, injurious. It plays in an amateurish, cowardly way with the most pregnant passion of men and women. Some of the mightiest productions of human genius are outlawed by the midgets of the censorship, creatures by excess of courtesy called men, creatures upon whom a RABELAIS, a BALSAC, or a RENÉ LE SAGE would not have bestowed even the notice of a contemptuous fillip of wit. The writer who should express all that the whole life of man expresses would find his work in the clutches of ANTHONY COMSTOCK, his publisher in prison, and his own name a synonym of shame in the mouths of the unthinking millions. Puritanism sets a price upon the head of the thinker, even as did Rome and Geneva. While sex is banned by church and state and fashion we can not expect that our literature will be free and virile.

I am going to quote here a strong paragraph which I have before presented to many of my readers, but it well will bear repetition. It was written by JAMES THOMSON and appears in "The SWINBURNE Controversy": "Our literature should be the clear and faithful mirror of our whole world of life, but at present there are vast realms of thought and imagination and passion and action, of which it is not allowed to give any reflex at all, or is allowed to give only a reflex so obscure and distorted as to be worse than none. But, it may be objected, suppose Satyrs come leering into your mirror and Bacchantes whirl before it? I answer that the business of a mirror is clear reflection; if it does not faithfully image the Satyr, how can it faithfully image Hyperion? And do you dread that the Satyr will be preferred to Hyperion, when both stand imaged in clear light before us? It is only when the windows are curtained, when the mirror is a black gulf and its portraitures are vague dark shadows, that the beautiful and the noble can pass undistinguished from the hideous and the vile. If, indeed, the realities not reflected became unrealities, were annihilated, then there would be some sense in veiling those portions of the mirror in front of which certain features of our life are exposed. And if that which sees not could not be seen, it would be very sensible of the hunted ostrich to hide its head in the sand. But we all know that in darkness what is filthy and vile grows ever filthier and viler, what is pure and sweet sickens and decays."

What JAMES THOMSON says, elsewhere in the same essay, of the degradation of literature in England, is still more applicable in the United States: "The condition of our literature in these days is disgraceful to a nation of men—Bumble has drugged all its higher powers, and only the rudest shocks can arouse them from their torpor. . . . 'We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us.' We have suppressed mention of all facts which Bumble would fain ignore, and utterance of all opinions likely to disturb his sacred peace; we have canted enough to nauseate the angels, and have continually lied for God as for a man to pleasure him; so our popular books are fit for

emasculated imbeciles. . . . In the meanwhile the police reports are full of putrid flesh, all the blue books are crammed with statistical dry bones; flesh from the carcasses and bones from the skeletons in that mass of death and corruption under our imperial [republican] whited sepulchre. . . . The stupidest popular book would not be popular did it not find a large number of people still more stupid than itself, to whom it is really entertaining and instructive. These stupid people one does not blame; one can only pity or envy them according to one's mood. But what shall one say of that large number of educated people who are not stupid, who are familiar with continental literature; who yet, if an English book appears advocating ideas such as they have been delighted with in a French or German dress, feign astonishment and horror, and join with all the poor little curs of Bumbledom in yelping and snarling at it? These men who know well what they are doing are the accomplices of Bumble who does not know what he is doing, who fondly fancies that he is doing something very different, in starving on thin diet and stupefying with narcotic drugs the intellect of our nation once so robust and active."

Q.—You would have the whole of human action and aspiration the storehouse of the novelist, the poet, the essayist?

A.—Yes. Nothing should be withheld from them; they should be free to draw from this storehouse to their utmost limit of capacity for construction and adornment. No longer should they be forced to make bricks without straw, to play Hamlet with Hamlet left out, to work with chained hands, to walk with manacled feet, to see with eyes half-closed. We can not be free until the sex taboo is taken off every fact and thought of life.

LIFE, LIBERTY, AND ETHICS

Pamphlets by EDWIN C. WALKER

Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses, 15c
Vice: Its Friends and Its Foes, 15c
What the Young Need to Know—A Primer of Sex Rationalism. Second Edition, 15c
Who Is the Enemy; ANTHONY COMSTOCK or YOU? Who sustains the Censorship? 20c
Communism and Conscience; PENTECOST and Paradox. Also, Crimes and Criminals. 25c
Bible Temperance. Liquor Drinking Defended, Commended, and Enjoined by the Bible. 10c
The Revival of Puritanism, 10c
Religion and Rationalism. The Relation of Each to Human Liberty. 5c
The Future of Secularism—When Will the Cause of Justice Triumph? 5c
GIORDANO BRUNO. His Life, Teachings, and Martyrdom. 5c
Variety versus Monogamy. An Address. 5c

THE RIGHTS OF PERIODICALS

BY JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

An illuminating and convincing defense of a free press, exposing the jugglery of the postal bureaucracy with second-class mail matter

Price, 10 Cents

LIBERTY:
Political, Religious, Social, and Sexual

BY A. F. TINDALL, A. T. C. L.

An Essay towards the Formation of an Anti-Persecution Society to Defend the Rights of Individuals against State Interference and Puritan Persecution

Price, 10 Cents

EDWIN C. WALKER,
244 W. 143d St., New York City

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 405 152 5

THE HOME CYCLOPEDIA

BY E. B. FOOTE, M. D.

A curious book for curious persons, and a sensible book for every one. It is valuable in every way; 1248 pages; 400 illustrations (eighty in colors); 250 recipes; is tastefully bound in cloth

Price, $2

VACCINATION A CRIME

BY FELIX L. OSWALD, M. D.

Vaccination Spreads Diseases. Vacccination Impairs the Organic Functions. Vaccination Encourages Reliance on Worthless Remedies. Vaccination Spreads Smallpox. ¶ Compulsory Vaccination Furnishes Dangerous Legal Precedents. Fallacies of the JENNER Doctrine ¶ Illustrated

Price, 10 Cents. If mailed, 13 Cents

MARRED IN THE MAKING

BY LYDIA KINGSMILL COMMANDER

A tragedy of heredity; the bale and ban of unloving union

Price, 25 Cents

THE CHRIST MYTH—A STUDY

BY ELIZABETH E. EVANS

An examination of the legends of an idealization

Price, 25 Cents

THE NEW HEDONISM

BY GRANT ALLEN ¶ Magnificent ¶ Price, 5c

EDWIN C. WALKER,
244 W. 143d St., New York City